

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 8 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 6 through 8 are withdrawn from consideration.

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection of the pending claims in the Office Action of October 26, 2006.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Corbett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,899,107)

Claims 1 through 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbett et al. (U.S. Patent 4,899,107) in view of Elder et al. (U.S. Patent 5,123,850). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants assert that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Turning to the Corbett et al. reference, the Corbett et al. reference illustrates the use of dowels 27 as alignment devices in a burn-in/test fixture for individual single semiconductor die which includes a die cavity plate 11 and probe plate 12.

The Elder et al. reference illustrates the use of a probe head for the burn-in testing of a single semiconductor die. At best, the Elder et al. reference merely states that the probe head could be configured to a plurality of semiconductor die, a complete semiconductor wafer, or to

the contact pads of a hybrid device. Elder contains no disclosure whatsoever as to how the Elder et al. probe head could be modified for testing such devices.

Applicants submit that the proposed combination of the cited prior art does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the presently claimed invention because any combination of the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the all the claim limitations of the claimed inventions and because there is no suggestion for any modification of the Corbett et al. reference either in the cited prior art or the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill, there can be no showing of success for any modification of the Corbett et al. reference, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the presently claimed invention, and any rejection of the claimed invention based on the cited prior art would be a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention based solely upon the Applicants' disclosure, not the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that any combination of the Corbett et al. reference in view of Elder et al. reference does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of presently amended independent claim 1 calling for "a first rigid support member for receiving a plurality of semiconductor dice in wafer form having a predetermined orientation, the first rigid support member having a plurality of contact members thereon, the plurality of contact members including a plurality of contact tips including at least one flat contact area for mating with a bump on the wafer, a raised electrical bump or a resilient finger, and having a plurality of electrical connectors connected to the contact members for establishing communication with test circuitry". Applicants assert that any combination of the Corbett et al. reference in view of Elder et al. reference fails to teach or suggest any such claim limitation. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable as well as dependent claims 2 through 5 therefrom.

Further, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion in the cited prior art or the knowledge generally available for any modification of the Corbett et al. burn-in test fixture for a single die to be modified such that it is a fixture to test a wafer having many dice in any orientation. The Elder et al. reference contains no such information as to how a test device for a single semiconductor die can be modified for testing a wafer. Elder et al. leaves to speculation as to how such single semiconductor die test apparatus could be fabricated. Applicants assert that a

careful reading of the Elder et al reference merely states that “The probe head illustrated in FIGS. 3 and 4 shows a bump pattern for a single die, but the probed (sic) head could be configured to a plurality of semiconductor die, a complete semiconductor wafer, or to the contact pads on a hybrid device”. Applicants assert that the Elder et al. reference is devoid of any teaching or suggestion as to how a testing apparatus comprising a first rigid support member for receiving a . . . wafer . . . having a predetermined orientation, the first rigid support member having a plurality of contact members thereon, the plurality of contact members including a plurality of contact tips including at least one flat contact area for mating with a bump on the wafer, a raised electrical bump or a resilient finger, and having a plurality of electrical connectors connected to the contact members for establishing communication with test circuitry and having a plurality of electrical connectors connected to the contact members for establishing communication with test circuitry; a second support member for selectively engaging the first rigid support member to retain the plurality of semiconductor dice in wafer form therebetween, one of the first rigid support member and the second support member including a single cavity for retaining the plurality of semiconductor dice in wafer form therein during testing; and a single biasing assembly including a single floating platform of a preselected area substantially sized for the single cavity, the single biasing assembly mounted to one of the first rigid support member and second support member, the single biasing assembly sized for uniformly biasing the plurality of semiconductor dice in wafer form against the contact members” can be fabricated. Applicants further assert that the Corbett et al. reference is further devoid of any teaching and suggestion concerning any such structure, but for individual semiconductor die. Applicants further assert that any combination of the Corbett et al. reference in view of the Elder et al. reference is devoid of any such teachings or suggestions.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited prior art cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1 through 5 are allowable.

Applicants request entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

In summary, Applicants submit that claims 1 through 5 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the entry of this amendment, the allowance of claims 1 through 5, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 19, 2006

JRD/mah:lmh

\\Traskbritt1\Shared\DOCS\2269-2825.10US\199973.doc